REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 16, 2001 with claims 1-28, of which claims 1, 15, 19, 24, 27, and 28 are independent claims. In the Amendment and Response to Office Action dated March 16, 2004, claims 9 and 23 were cancelled. In the

5 Amendment and Response to Office Action dated August 25, 2004, claims 29 and 30 were added. Claims 1-8, 10-22, and 24-30 are currently pending in the above-identified patent application. Applicants note that, in the Office Action Summary, the Examiner did not indicate that claims 29-30 are pending (as was indicated in the previous Office Action).

10   In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 27 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,721,827, hereinafter "Logan," in view of Yahagi et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,984,274, hereinafter "Yahagi." The Examiner also rejected claims 8, 10-22, 24-26, and 28-30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Yahagi, and further

15 in view of Ladd et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,539,359, hereinafter "Ladd."

Independent Claims 1, 15, 19, 24, 27 and 28

Independent claims 1 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Yahagi, and claims 15, 19, 24, and 28 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Yahagi, and further

20 in view of Ladd. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Logan lacks "determining a first and second time associated with a speaking of a first and second of the voice commands, wherein said first and second voice command identifies a start and end of said time interval and storing data identifying said time interval and data identifying one or more of said first voice command and second voice command," but

25 asserts that Yahagi discloses these limitations.

Applicants note that Yahagi is directed to a speech recognition apparatus for *controlling a stop watch* with means for preventing errors due to delay in the speech recognition process (see, Abstract), and that Logan is directed to an *audio program and message distribution system* in which a host system organizes and transmits program

30 segments to client subscriber locations (see, Abstract). Applicants maintain that Yahagi and Logan are therefore directed to unrelated art and that there is no motivation to

2

combine the cited references. Applicants have also found no disclosure or suggestion in either Yahagi or Logan to combine the features cited by the Examiner. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not look to combine Yahagi and Logan.

Regarding the Examiner's assertion that Yahagi discloses storing data identifying said time interval (stores measurement time data) and data identifying one or more of said first voice command and second voice command (col. 3, line 33, to col. 4, line 14). As the Examiner notes, Yahagi *stores **measurement time data***. Measurement time data, however, does ***not** "identify" a time interval*. For example, two time intervals may have the same measurement time data, but have different identities.

In addition, in the text cited by the Examiner, Yahagi teaches that "it *stores measurement time data* from the measuring circuit 14 in *an address area designated from a plurality of data memory areas* 17a, 17b, . . . , of a RAM 17 and designates the next memory area." (Col. 3, lines 39-42; emphasis added.) Applicants could find no disclosure or suggestion by Yahagi to *store **data identifying** one or more of said first voice command and second voice command*.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Applicants note that neither Logan nor Yahagi disclose or suggest *storing data identifying a time interval **and** data identifying one or more of the first voice and second voice commands*. Independent claims 1, 19, and 27 require storing *data identifying said time interval* and *data identifying one or more of said first voice command and second voice command*. Independent claims 15, 24, and 28 require determining a plurality of time increments, *each time increment comprising one of the tasks and at least one of the times*; and *storing one or more of said time increments* (wherein each task is associated with at least one of the times and at least one of the voice commands).

Thus, Logan and Yahagi, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest storing data identifying said time interval and data identifying one or more of said first voice command and second voice command, as required by claims 1, 19, and 27, and do not disclose or suggest determining a plurality of time increments, each time increment comprising one of the tasks and at least one of the times; and storing one or more of said time increments, as required by claims 15, 24, and 28.

3

Additional Cited References

Ladd was also cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of converting each of at least two voice commands to text. Applicants note that Ladd is directed to a markup language for interactive services (see, Abstract). Ladd does not address the issue of determining time intervals utilizing and storing voice commands.

Thus, Ladd does not disclose or suggest storing data identifying said time interval and data identifying one or more of said first voice command and second voice command, as required by claims 1, 19, and 27, and does not disclose or suggest determining a plurality of time increments, each time increment comprising one of the tasks and at least one of the times; and storing one or more of said time increments, as required by claims 15, 24, and 28.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 10-14, 16-18, 20-22, 25-26 and 29-30

Dependent claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Yahagi, and claims 8, 10-14, 16-18, 20-22, 25-26, and 29-30 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Yahagi, and further in view of Ladd.

Claims 2-8, 10-14, and 29, claims 16-18, claims 20-22 and 30, and claims 25-26 are dependent on claims 1, 15, 19, and 24, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Logan et al., Yahagi et al., and Ladd et al. (alone or in any combination) because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 15, 19, and 24 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

Conclusion

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-8, 10-22, and 24-30, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

5

Date: August 9, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
10   1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560